

Course analysis (course evaluation)

Course code 1BI047	Course title Pathology	Credits 3
Semester (spring/autumn) Spring	Period 200316-200326, examination senarelagd till 2020-04-14	

Course coordinator Sara Windahl	Examiner Sara Windahl
Teacher in charge of component Sara Windahl	Other participating teachers Tuomas Näreoja – Responsible for the lab project

Number of registered students during the three-week check 49	Number approved on the last course date 34	Response frequency course valuation survey 35,3%
Other methods for student influence (in addition to concluding course valuation) Course evaluation council consisting of 3 student representatives. All three were present at the Zoom meeting with the course director and a teacher at the department.		
Feedback reporting of the course valuation results to the students Uploaded on the open course site in Canvas 2020-05-13		

Note that...

The analysis should (together with a summarising quantitative summary of the students' course evaluation) be communicated to the education committee at the department responsible for the course and for programme courses also the programme coordinating committee.

The analysis was communicated to the education committee on the following date: 2020-05-15.
The analysis was communicated to the programme coordinating committee on the following date: 2020-05-15.

1. Description of any conducted changes since the previous course occasion based on the views of former students

Lectures and seminars

The PDFs of the lectures were named after the lectures and ordered according to date in Canvas. As a reminder of some of the knowledge from previous courses and introduction of the knowledge to a new context, the lecture "Cell adaptation, injury and death" was adjusted and given only as a PDF. In order to facilitate learning, nnotations were given in webmicroscope.

The lab project

The instruction to the lab project and bonus points, and the lab compendium were revisited and improved. In order to prevent the students to use excessive time on the lab project. a maximum page number for the lab project was given, and it was stressed not to extend it. An interactive Q and A session was given in Zoom in order to improve communication and assure that all students were given the same information regarding the lab project.

The examination

Information regarding the type of questions and how many of each type was given well before the examination, and the answers to the multiple-choice questions were given out together with the student's results.

2. Brief summary of the students' valuations of the course

We must keep in mind that only 35% of the class answered the KI survey.

Most of the responding students thought that they had learned the intended learning outcomes and that the course structure and methods used (e.g. lectures, exercises, seminars, assignments etc.) were relevant in relation to the learning outcomes.

Strengths:

The communication and organization were excellent throughout, and the requirements were clear. The lectures were considered well structured, of good quality, very well explained, and the demonstrations were highly appreciated. Web microscope (and the whole histology part) and the seminar questions were found very useful. Lab project, albeit repetitive, was also considered useful, and the feedback to the lab project and oral exam were good. Oral exam was appreciated as it helped to start studying early. The exam was organized in a fair way and students concerns were heard and considered.

Suggestions for improvements:

General

More time to study was requested. It was also suggested that the tissue biology and pathology course are combined and placed after the physiology course.

Lectures and seminars

It was suggested that a Q&A/seminar kind of session is given for discussions of the answers to the seminar and practice exam. Another suggestion was to alter the lecture on biobanking.

The lab project

More information about the requirements for the lab project and the the use of Image J was requested. One student suggested adding more/different pathological conditions instead of analysing multiples of the same condition, which would hopefully allow to teach more biology-related material. The lab project was considered too time consuming by some students.

The examination

The information that the original exam was cancelled came too late

Summary from "Course evaluation council"

Strengths:

General

In general, the participants were happy with the course and appreciate it. Zoom worked well and the course was well organized. The course director communicated very well with the course participants.

Lectures and seminars

The online and PDF lectures were good and easy to follow. The class especially like the microscopy sessions. The seminar questions were good and helpful.

The lab project

The content of the lab project had a good match with the lectures.

The examination

The time for the examination, 1h 20', was working fine. The students found they had to rush a bit, but it was manageable. The students have had digital examination before and prefer digital examination compared to paper examination. Among the advantages are that they type faster than writing with a pen, they can easily delete and rewrite a text. It is also more convenient when they receive the results from a digital examination compared to a paper examination.

Suggestions for improvements:

Lectures and seminars

The biobanking and ethics lecture should be revisited and adjusted.

The lab project

Extend the introduction of the lab project. The lab project responsible person may show all the steps for one sample in Image J for all students, while, at the same time, the students perform the same steps on their own computers.

The examination

The students would have preferred if the KI guidelines regarding digital examination online could have been sent out before the examination although they were available at the KI website.

3. The course coordinator's reflections on the implementation and results of the course

The examination was given online in Inpera without any means of surveillance. Five cases (out of 47 participating students) of suspected misleading during examination were discovered and reported. This is in striking contrast to the last time the course was given, where no students were reported for misleading during the examination.

Strengths of the course:

The lecturers and slides were in general of good quality and appreciated. The seminar was highly appreciated by most of the students. The microscopy sessions were in general very good and appreciated and the students appreciated the format of digital examination.

Suggestions for improvements:

The students still have some problems with Image J and the biobanking and ethics lecture could be improved.

4. Course coordinator's conclusions and any suggestions for changes

The university decided to give all teaching online at the time the course started. All lectures were given online, recorded (part from the first) and uploaded to the course site in Canvas. New directions were sent to the course director the day before the exam. Therefore, the course director organised a meeting with the course student council regarding the new information and the exam was then postponed. The new exam date was set to the week after Easter as per the student's request. Due to the original exam being postponed, the first re-examination was also postponed in order to give the students more time to study. The second re-examination is not postponed.

Before the next course occasion:

Consider how to improve the experience of the lab project. The project is intended for the students to learn how to independently evaluate data from a tissue analysis laboratory project by using

different means of counting (manual and automated). Thus, the best means to improve the lab experience may other than the student's suggestion which would reduce the independent learning part. The biobanking and ethics lecture should be revisited and improved.

Appendices: KI Survey: "KI enkät Pathology 1BI047 VT20".